

REMARKS

Claims 1-56 have been examined in the Application.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 53-56.

In addition, the Examiner indicated that claims 8-12, 21-24, 30-34, 44, 45 and 49-52 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowable subject matter but decline to rewrite claims 8-12, 21-24, 30-34, 44, 45 and 49-52 in independent form.

Reply to 35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 13, 14-16, 17, 18-20, 25, 26, 27, 28, 37, 46 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Read et al (U.S. patent No 6,236,623). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the Read reference to the present invention and traverses this rejection for the following reasons. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that:

“Read substantially discloses (fig. 2) every feature of the claimed invention: A synchronization of clocks in a plurality of devices connected by a communication channel, a master control device having a first clock coupled to one or more slave control devices 14 having a second clock, sending a first message from the master clock 12 to the slave control 14 comprising a **first transit time** T1 of (Tp1 +Tc1)...” (Bold emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully asserts that Read does not transmit a first message containing any time information. Read is directed to a system and method for synchronizing clocks in a plurality of devices across a communication channel. The system includes a master control device coupled to one or more slave control devices across a communication channel. For example, FIG. 2 shows that at time T0 a master device sends an interrogation command 42 and at time T0 + T1 a slave device receives

the interrogation command. In other words, while it is true that the interrogation command 42 is received at a time $T_0 + T_1$, it is also clear that this time information is **not** contained in the actual command. Next, the slave responds by sending a reply (acknowledgement) message 44 to the master and at time $T_0 + T_1 + T_2$ the master receives the reply message 44. Read then divides a loop delay 46 ($T_1 + T_2$) by 2 to arrive at a transit time delay 48 (T_1 or T_2). Then Read uses the transit time delay 48, along with various methods, to actually synchronize the slave devices.

In contrast thereto, the present invention is directed to a method of time synchronization performed by exchanging messages containing **time information** between a clock master and a clock slave. As recited in claim 1, the method includes sending a first message to the clock master, where the **first message contains information indicating a first transmission time of the first message**, and receiving a second message from the clock master, where the **second message contains information indicating a first reception time of the first message and a second transmission time of the second message**. In other words, a first message contains a **first time stamp** of the transmission of the first message and the second message contains a **second time stamp** of receipt of the first message and transmission of the second message. The two time stamps are used to make calculations for synchronizing a slave device to a master device. In contrast, Read does not transmit a first message containing any time information or time stamp indicating time of transmission. Accordingly Read does not anticipate claims 1-7, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18-20, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 37, 46 and 47 of the present invention.

Reply to 35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 35, 36, 38, 40-42 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Read et al (U.S. Patent 6, 236, 623) in view of Lundh et al (U.S. Patent 6,373,834).

As explained above in response to the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102. Applicant respectfully asserted that Read et al. does not anticipate the method of the

present invention. Thus, Read et al in combination with Lundh et al does not disclose, teach or suggest the method recited in claims 35, 36, 38, 40-42 and 47 for at least the same reasons as above.

Request for Reconsideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the Office Action mailed on October 29, 2004, Applicant requests reconsideration in the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and requests that the Examiner allow claim(s) 1-56 and pass the application to issue. If there are any fees due, please charge any such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1561 and reference Attorney Docket No. 29633.046300. If there is any point requiring further attention prior to allowance, the Examiner is asked to contact Applicants' counsel who can be reached at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully,
Allen W. Stichter

By: Claude R. Narcisse
Claude R. Narcisse
Reg. No. 38,979
(212) 801-3190

Date: January 31, 2005